

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/606,503	06/26/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14046US02	5221	
23446 MCANDREW	7590 04/28/200 'S HELD & MALLOY,	EXAM	EXAMINER		
500 WEST MADISON STREET			WONG, BLANCHE		
SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, II	, 60661	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,		2419			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/606,503	KARAOGUZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Blanche Wong	2419	

	Blanche Wong	2419	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notic replies: (1) an amendment, aff eal (with appeal fee) in complia	e of Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evidence, v ance with 37 CFR 41.31; o	vhich places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set ater than SIX MONTHS from the r b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	nailing date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CF ension and the corresponding am hortened statutory period for reply than three months after the mailin	ount of the fee. The appropri originally set in the final Offic g date of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as wen if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e	)), to avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS  3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application below	nsideration and/or search (see w);	NOTE below);	
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a (  NOTE:, (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4.	·		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the proposed amendment of the proving the pro		will be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under a and was not earlier presented	ppeal and/or appellant fail d. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		•	
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
/Edan Orgad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419	/Blanche Wong/ Examiner, Art Unit 2	419	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to claim 1, Applicant states that "Carces does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of receiving a response from said at least one of a plurality of access points," Remark, p.11, para. 2. Applicant also states that "the synch response 216 does not reporting back to the erf a plurality of access points." Remark, p.11, para. 2. Applicant also states that "the synch response 216 does not reporting back to the erf a plurality of access points." Remark, p.12, para. 2. Examiner has shown at least one access device located within a coverage area of the WAP device L 1 130. Remark, p.12, para. 1. Examiner has shown at least one prince proof access device, namely WAP device. If Applicant is arguing a form/bype of reporting back or more than one presence of access device, such a limitation is not found in the claims. Therefore, rejections maintain. Response to Arguments: Applicant states that "tiple issue here is whether or not the sync response contains information and is reporting a presence of an access device that is located within the coverage area of the WAP device L 1 130. Remark, p.9, para. 1. Examiner has shown at least one form of reporting back using the sync response and at least one presence of access device, namely WAP device. Again, if Applicant is arguing "reporting back" is e.g. a message contains information, such a limitation is not found in the claim. If Applicant is arguing the presence of another access device, other than the access device that is performing the method of claim I (including broadcastion, receiving, and requestion), and imitation is not found in the claim.

By having the WAP device responds to the remote device, it is inherent that the presence of the WAP device is known to the remote device. The claim language does not differentiable between different WAP devices and their presence but rather limits it to only one device and therefore only one response is necessary to equate "presence".

As Applicant points out, "claims 7,13,19,23 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1." Remark, p.12, para. 3. Please see comments for claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8-12.14-18.20-22.24-25 depend from independent claims 1.7.13.19.23.